UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,242	11/16/2006	Gerardo Caja Lopez	Q-92179	8695
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 06/26/200 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			LACYK, JOHN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3735	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/563,242	CAJA LOPEZ ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John P. Lacyk	3735			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
<i>;</i> —	, 				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
ologod in addordance with the practice and c	x parte gaayle, 1000 G.B. 11, 10	0.0.210.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Application Papers					
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)					

Art Unit: 3735

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 2

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Caja Lopez et al (2001/0001176) in view of Platt (5,937,789).

Caja Lopez et al discloses a capsule located in a stomach of an animal. Caja Lopez et al teaches that in prior art devices, that it is well known to use a capsule having a length of about 75mm and a diameter of about 18 mm and have a device whose density exceeds 2 g/cm3 (paragraph 0003). The Caja Lopez et al device, specifically, has a density of "not less than 3.5 g/cm3" and a weight of 65-60 g, length of 69mm and a diameter of 20mm (see Table 1 and paragraph 0023). While Caja Lopez et al does teach a density of not less than 3.5 g/cm3, which would include being equal to or greater than 4 g/cm3, Caja Lopez et al does not specifically teach a density equal to or greater than 4 g/cm3 or a specific gravity equal to or greater than 3. Platt discloses a similar capsule and teaches that the body should have a density of at least 3 g/cm3 and a specific gravity of at least 4. Platt further discloses that the density needs to be sufficiently high so that the incidence of rejection may be minimized and that it is well known to use a material including zirconium oxide (which would inherently have a density equal to or greater than 4 g/cm3) (see abstract and column 2, line 48- column 3, line 3). Therefore a modification of Caja Lopez et al such that the material used is a zirconium oxide would have been obvious in view of the teachings of Platt which show

Art Unit: 3735

that it is well known to use such a material with a capsule in order to provide the desired density and specific gravity to maintain the device in the animal.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hanton et al is cited to further show the state of the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Lacyk whose telephone number is (571)272-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chuck Marmor, II can be reached on 571-272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/563,242 Page 4

Art Unit: 3735

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

J.P. Lacyk

/John P Lacyk/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 37355